

most innovative, visionary, and generous business leaders.

David Packard was an outstanding public servant as well. He was Deputy Secretary of Defense under Secretary Melvin Laird, 1969–71, in what many consider one of the strongest teams ever to head the Department of Defense. His understanding of both broad issues and nuts and bolts of management was the ideal complement to Laird's knowledge of the Pentagon and Washington.

More recently, Packard chaired the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management under President Reagan—generally known as the Packard Commission. The Commission's study of the Department's procurement process led to the establishment of the position of Undersecretary for Acquisition and to the streamlining of military buying practices. He testified on a number of occasions before the Armed Services Committee and provided valuable advice on organization and buying procedures. He was always extremely helpful to the committee and to me whenever we called on him.

A few years after their graduation from Stanford during the Great Depression, David Packard and William Hewlett borrowed \$538 from a former professor and launched Hewlett-Packard in the garage of Packard's rented house. It is one of the great American success stories.

"We weren't interested in the idea of making money. Our idea was if you couldn't find a job, you'd make one for yourself. Our first several years we made 25 cents an hour." Today his company is our Nation's second largest computer company and Silicon Valley's biggest employer, with 100,000 employees around the world and \$31 billion in sales last year.

Packard became one of the richest men in America, but he lived modestly to the end, using his great wealth to follow, on a broader scale, the principles that guided him in managing the company—encouraging individual creativity, providing opportunity for development of knowledge and skills, fostering mutual respect and trust.

The key to his business success was the key to his character as well. The important thing was to make or do something useful. He had no patience with ostentation in corporate executives, nor with those who made short-term profits made by cutting long-term investment in research, new product development, customer services, or facilities and equipment.

David Packard's management philosophy and methods became models for other companies. He viewed his employees as colleagues with ideas, skills, loyalty, and understanding he valued. He practiced management by walking the factory floor and insisted on an open-door policy in executive offices. Workers called him Dave and he encouraged them to come to him with their gripes as well as their ideas for

improving products and operations. In return, they gave him undying loyalty and the benefit of their best efforts and creative ideas.

He was semiretired through the 1980's, but he and William Hewlett returned to the company in 1991 when it experienced a financial slump. Packard was the driving force behind the reorganization that revitalized the company.

When Packard retired as chairman for a second time in 1993, someone asked him what was his proudest moment. Instead of pointing to one of his many accomplishments, David Packard said simply, "Do something useful, then forget about it and go on to the next thing. Don't gloat about it."

That accurately described his own approach throughout a long and imminently successful life. Whenever he finished doing something useful, he looked for something else useful to do.

A Phi Beta Kappa, football and basketball player at Stanford, he was a dedicated outdoorsman all his life, and a staunch Republican. He made major gifts over the years to Stanford, the Monterey Bay Aquarium, and the Wolf Trap Foundation.

One of his last acts, not long before he died, was to give a generous donation to the Paralympics that will be held in Atlanta this summer, the week after the Centennial Olympic games. It was typical of David Packard that, at 83, he was thinking about ways to encourage individual excellence, helping to provide talented athletes from disabled community the opportunity to participate in international competition.

Our Nation is a better place because of his innovations, his philosophy, his example, and his dedication to both making and doing something useful. David Packard's character matched his physique—he was a giant of a man.

His beloved wife, Lucille Laura Salter Packard, died in 1987. I know the Senate joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to his children, who were at his side when he died: David Woodley Packard, Nancy Ann Packard Burnett, Susan Packard Orr, and Julie Elizabeth Packard.

TRIBUTE TO EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise to join with my fellow Senators in mourning the death of former Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, and in paying tribute to one of the most distinguished and influential Members of this body during a turbulent period in our history.

Ed Muskie worked his way through Bates College, where he was a Phi Beta Kappa, and earned a scholarship to Cornell's law school. After serving in the Navy on destroyer escorts during World War II, he was elected to the Maine House, where he served as minority leader. He won the Governorship of Maine during the Eisenhower years when no Democrat had held the office

in 20 years, and was easily re-elected. He revitalized the State party and was elected and re-elected to the U.S. Senate until his resignation to become Secretary of State in 1980 during the last difficult months of the Iran hostage crisis. It was a time of great tension following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, during which the United States boycotted the Olympic games in Moscow.

Ed Muskie was Hubert Humphrey's Vice-Presidential running mate in 1968. Few people remember how close that election was, and one reason it was so close was the strength Ed Muskie brought to the ticket. He started out the frontrunner, but his own campaign for the Presidential nomination in 1972 was unsuccessful, damaged by the dirty tricks the Nation would only learn about only later. It is ironic, but a tribute to the man, that the most damaging thing his enemies could point to in his conduct was that he loved his wife enough to lose his usual control when they attempted to slander her.

Senator Muskie returned to the Senate and in 1974 became the first chairman of the Budget Committee. I had the privilege of serving with him on the committee during my formative early years in the Senate. He was a strong voice for budget stability. The processes he established for monitoring Federal spending, and his insistence on holding down spending across a broad range, including the areas of his own major concerns. This is the same process being used today in our attempt to achieve a balanced budget by 2007.

Senator Muskie deserves major credit for most of the important early environmental legislation. He held together fragile coalitions of liberals and conservatives in budget battles, challenged Presidential policies and his own wing of the Democratic party for its failure to change. Through it all, he earned the respect of both allies and foes.

After his stint as Secretary of State, he retired to private law practice. He returned briefly to public service in 1987 on the Special Review Board on the Iran-Contra Scandal, also known as the Tower Commission.

Ed Muskie was a big man, big enough to still the voices of hecklers by inviting them up on the platform with him, big enough early in his Senate career to stand up to majority leader Lyndon Johnson at the height of his power, and big enough to gain the respect of his fellow Senators, and of Johnson himself. He believe in what he called a politics of trust, not of fear.

Ed Muskie was often described as "Lincolnesque." His middle name, Sixtus, was the name of five Popes during the 15th and 16th centuries. His last name had been shortened by immigration officials from what they considered the unpronounceable Polish name of his forefathers when his father arrived at Ellis Island. But whatever people called him, wherever his names came from, Ed Muskie was his own man.

What we remember is not the occasional flash of temper but his modesty, moderation, and self-deprecating humor, and his capacity for bridging differences. He was a man of great humanity who stood for reason and reconciliation in a time of division and disunity.

Ed Muskie graced this body with his healing and imposing presence, his self-deprecating humor, and his personal integrity for 21 years. He served his State and country courageously for more than three decades. I am honored to have served with him, and want to express my deepest sympathy, and that of this body, to Jane, his wonderful wife of 48 years, and to their children Stephen, Ellen, Melinda, Martha, and Edmund, Jr.

CHILD CARE PROVIDERS WEEK

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, every morning, millions of parents kiss their children goodbye as they trade the hat of parent for the hat of teacher, police officer, waitress or doctor. When they leave home to work, they must leave their precious young ones in the care of someone else. Sometimes, parents find a relative. More often, they rely on strangers. As a parent myself, I know how difficult it can be to trust someone else with the well being of your child. Fortunately, most parents have reliable child care providers to depend on. We hear occasional horror stories of abuse and mistreatment by child care providers, but the majority of child care workers always have the best interests of the child at heart. April 21-28 will be the Week of the Young Child. During this important week, South Dakota will recognize Child Care Provider's Day on April 22. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize these hard working child care providers who support millions of American families each day.

My State has a claim to fame that most Americans would not guess. According to the most recent census data, 71 percent of mothers with children under the age of six are working moms. The national average is less than 60 percent. This means that reliable, quality child care is an issue not just for parents in urban areas. Families in rural States must search for adequate child care, too. For families who live in remote areas of South Dakota, this may mean driving to the next town to find day care services.

Child care providers do not have an easy task. A child's formative years are crucial. Caretakers must provide a stimulating environment for growth and learning. They do not merely babysit. Each child must be reached individually to develop language, reasoning and motor skills. Only a secure and nurturing environment can allow this to happen. In creating a home away from home, child care workers are providing American families with a very valuable service. For most families, success at work and stable home rela-

tionships hinge on professional child care.

Congress has been working hard over the last year to reform the Federal child care system. I wholeheartedly support efforts to end overlap of programs and needless bureaucracy. Child care should be affordable, accessible, and reliable. I will continue working in Washington to ensure quality child care for all American families.

Many thanks to the child care workers who daily provide for our children. They keep our families and workplaces on track. They should receive special recognition during the Week of the Young Child.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, March 28, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,071,791,748,467.89.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,173.26 as his or her share of that debt.

GATT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, yesterday I spoke briefly about our failure to correct a loophole in the GATT legislation which gives a handful of companies unprecedented and unintended special treatment. Our distinguished colleague, Senator HATCH, raised a few points which my distinguished colleague, Senator CHAFEE and I feel deserve clarification.

For several months, we have sought an opportunity to remedy the mistake made by Congress and the administration when the GATT implementing legislation was enacted. The legislation's grandfather provisions were meant to apply to every person, product, company, and industry in the country. But the final GATT legislation accidentally excluded the prescription drug industry because it lacked a conforming amendment to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. As a result, the prescription drug industry is the only industry in the country which received the patent extension but is unfairly exempted and shielded from competition. Because of this mistake, consumers and taxpayers are paying billions of dollars far too much for a handful of drugs, including Zantac, the world's best-selling drug.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I agree entirely with my colleague, Senator PRYOR, and wish to raise one simple but important point. It should be noted clearly and conclusively that there is an extensive record of evidence from the U.S. Trade Representative, the Patent and Trademark Office, and the Food and Drug Administration that a mistake was made by both the Congress and the administration. There is absolutely no question as to this fact. To dispel any doubts, I would like to submit for the RECORD an excerpt from Ambassador Mickey Kantor's testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee on February 27:

The Congress and the Administration did not, however, take into account the technical interrelationship between the Patent Act and the regulation of pharmaceutical products by the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. In fact, no one—including those in the private sector who watched these developments closely—took this interrelationship into account. This [Senate Judiciary] Committee and the House Judiciary Committee held a joint hearing on August 12, 1994, to review the intellectual property provisions of the URAA and not a single reference was made to this system. In all this time, not a single reference was made to the fact that pharmaceuticals may be treated differently than other forms of technology, not even by Gerald Mossinghoff of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, who testified in support of this legislation without referring to this provision . . . We did not intend for this to happen and we support the correction of this oversight through the appropriate amendments to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and the Patent Act.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly with Senator CHAFEE. Let me add that for a number of months, we have sought an opportunity to vote on the missing conforming amendment. In December, a primary argument against acting on the amendment was the alleged need for a committee hearing. The February 27 hearing was never sought by us and, in fact, it did not add a single additional fact to the public record on this issue. The hearing simply reinforced the substantial body of evidence which proves a costly and inequitable mistake was made and is in urgent need of correction.

Nor has a markup in any committee ever been an objective of those seeking to correct this congressional mistake. As chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator HATCH promised a markup on this issue by the end of March. That apparently was not possible. My colleagues, Senators CHAFEE and BROWN, and I believe very strongly that any further delay in remedying this clear and costly congressional error will only benefit a handful of companies at the expense of their competitors and the American public.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a withdrawal and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:59 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by